

REMARKS

Claims 1-23, 25, 27, and 30-39 were pending in the application at the time of examination.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 22, 30, 32, 33, 36, and 38 are amended. The amendments correct items identified by the Examiner, further correct minor informalities, and place the application in better form for allowance. Applicant submits no new matter has been added.

Accordingly, in view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and so entry of the amendments is appropriate under Rule 116. If the Examiner should disagree, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this paper to narrow the issues for appeal.

Claims 1-23, 25, 27, and 30-39 remain pending in the application.

Objection

In the Office Action at page 4, paragraph 8, the Examiner required correction of "an" to "a" in Claim 22, line 7. Applicant has amended Claim 22 to recite "a target computer system". Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22 as amended overcomes the Examiner's objection. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the objection to Claim 22.

Rejections - 35 USC §112

Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30, 33, 36, and 38

In the Office Action at page 4, paragraph 11, the Examiner stated in part:

Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30, 33, 36 and 38 substantially recite, "a collaborative shell program, **the collaborative shell program for linking....**" ...This is an intended use limitation; language that suggests

or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (intended use language being one such example). Therefore, the claims are rendered indefinite as it is unclear what, specifically, the applicant intends to claim.

Applicant has amended each of Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30, 36, and 38 to delete the term "for" from the above highlighted phrase. Applicant respectfully submits each of Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30, 36, and 38 as amended are definite and overcome the Examiner's rejections. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 112 rejections of each of Claims 1, 3, 5, 19, 30, 36, and 38.

Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 33 is in proper "means for" format, and thus the use of the word "for" is proper in Claim 33. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 33 is definite. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 112 rejection of Claim 33.

Claims 22, 26, 36, and 38

In the Office Action at page 5, paragraph 12, the Examiner stated in part:

Claims 22, 26, 36, and 38 substantially recite, "said selectable identifier **identifying an target computer system for connection**....said selectable identifier **identifying a program for execution** in the..." ...This is an intended use limitation; language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation (intended use language being one such example). Therefore, the claims are rendered indefinite as it is unclear what, specifically, the applicant intends to claim.

Applicant has amended Claim 22 to delete the phrase "for connection" and to add the word "connectable" and to delete the phrase "for execution" and to add the word "executable". Applicant respectfully submits Claim 22 as amended is definite and overcomes the Examiner's rejections. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 112 rejection of Claim 22.

Applicant respectfully point out that Claim 26 was cancelled in the Amendment of July 23, 2007, and thus the Examiner's rejection of Claim 26 is moot, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 36 and 38 were amended to delete the word "for" as earlier described with regard to the Examiner's rejections in paragraph 11. Further, Claims 36 and 38 do not recite the highlighted phrases called out by the Examiner. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits Claims 22, 36, and 38 are definite (Claim 26 having been earlier deleted) and overcome the Examiner's objections. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 112 rejections of claims 22, 26, 36, and 38.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 30, 33, 36, and 38

In the Office Action at pages 5-6, paragraph 13, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 3, 5, 30, 33, 36, and 38 "...for limitations that lack antecedent basis..."

Claim 1

Applicant has amended Claim 1 to recite at least: "...a command line interface..." at line 8; "...the command line interface (CLI) shell program..." at line 24; "...the CLI shell program..." at line 25, and "...the command line interface..." at line 26. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 1 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 1.

Claim 3

Applicant has amended Claim 3 to recite at least "...a user..." at line 11. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 3 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 3.

Claim 5

Applicant has amended Claim 5 to recite at least "...a user..." at line 13. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 5 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 5.

Claim 30

Applicant has amended Claim 30 to recite at least "...the first user computer system..." at line 25, 28 and 30; and "...a user..." at line 27. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 30 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 30.

Claim 33

Applicant has amended Claim 33 to recite at least "...a user computer system..." at line 24. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 33 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 33.

Claim 36

Applicant has amended Claim 36 to recite at least "...one or more user computer systems..." at lines 11-12. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 36 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 36.

Claim 38

Applicant has amended Claim 38 to recite at least "...one or more user computer systems" at line 12. Applicant respectfully submits Claim 38 as amended recites proper antecedent basis. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 38.

Rejections - 35 USC §102

Claims 1-12, 19-21, 30, and 32-35 are not anticipated by Pioch

In the Office Action at page 7, paragraph 16, the Examiner stated:

Claims 1-12, 19-21, 30, and 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pioch ("A short IRC primer", Edition 1.1b, February 29, 1993).

Claims 1 and 2 are not anticipated by Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 1 and 2.

With regard to Claim 1, the Examiner at pages 7-8, paragraph 17, stated in part:

As to claim 1, Pioch discloses a system comprising:...

...an instant messaging (IM) server computer system coupled to the network (pg. 4, sec. 1.1: paragraph 5) the IM server computer system comprising:

a collaborative shell program (pg. 4, sec. 1.1: paragraph 5, IRC clients read on "a collaborative shell program"), the collaborative shell program for linking the command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer system to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application to permit a user of the at least one user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the

user on the at least one user computer system (pg. 5, sec. 1.4: paragraph 2, commands are entered via the CLI such commands including /INVITE and /KICK which elicit responses from a target computer (pg. 14, sec. 2.3: paragraphs 13-15:/INVITE <nickname> [<channel>] and pg. 14, sec. 2.3: paragraphs 19-20: /KICK [<channel>]<nickname>),....

Claim 1 recites in part at least:

a network;

an instant messaging (IM) server computer system coupled to the network, the IM server computer system comprising:

a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application to permit a user of at least one user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system, and

an instant messaging (IM) server application coupled with the collaborative shell program;

at least one user computer system coupled to the network, the at least one user computer system comprising:

an instant messaging (IM) client application, and

the command line interface (CLI) shell program, the CLI shell program further including a command line interface; and

at least one target computer system coupled to the network. (emphasis added)

Pioch at sec. 1.1, paragraph 5 describes:

IRC is based on a client-server model. Clients are programs that connect to a server, a server is a program that transports data (messages), from a user client to another. There are clients running on many different systems, (Unix, emacs, VMS, MSDOS, VM...), that allow you to connect to an IRC server. **The client which will be spoken of here is the most widespread: ircII, (originally designed by Michael**

Sandrof). Other clients are similar, and often accept ircII commands. (emphasis added)

Applicant submits that the above citation to Pioch relied on by the Examiner merely describes that ircII is a client program that can connect to a server, i.e., an IRC server (see for example, Pioch, sec. 3.2).

Distinguishably, Claim 1 recites in part at least an **"...IM server computer system..."** in which the **"...IM server computer system..."** comprises: (1) **"...a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application to permit a user of the at least one user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system..."**; and (2) **"...an instant messaging (IM) server application coupled with the collaborative shell program..."**

Further, the citations to Pioch at sec. 1.4, paragraph 2 and sec. 2.3, paragraphs 13-15, 19-20 relied on by the Examiner merely describe commands that are entered at the ircII client for sending to the IRC server application.

Distinguishably, Claim 1 recites in part at least "a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application to permit a user of at least one user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the at least one user computer system". More particularly, an "at least one target computer system" is a separate element of Claim 1, i.e.,

is a separate element from the "IM server application computer system".

Further, Applicant notes that IRC is a "full-screen utility" (see Pioch, sec. 1.5, paragraph 1), and thus a chat window as claimed in Claim 1 is not described or suggested by Pioch.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the references to Pioch relied on by the Examiner fail to support an anticipation rejection of Claim 1. As Claim 2 depends from Claim 1, Applicant submits Claim 2 is also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 1 and 2.

Claims 3 and 4 are not anticipated by Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 3 and 4.

Applicant submits that for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Claim 3 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 4 depends from Claim 3, Applicant submits Claim 4 is also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 3 and 4.

Claims 5-18 are not anticipated by Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 5 and 18.

Applicant submits that for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Claim 5 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claim 6-18 depend from Claim 5, Applicant submits Claims 6-18 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 5-12.

Claims 19-21 are not anticipated by Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 19-21.

Applicant submits that for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Claim 19 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claims 20-21 depend from Claim 19, Applicant submits Claims 20-21 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 19-21.

Claims 30 and 32 are not anticipated by Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 30 and 32.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Claim 30 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claims 31 and 32 depend from Claim 30, Applicant submits Claims 31 and 32 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 30 and 32.

Claims 33-35 are not anticipated by Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 33-35.

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the same reasons as Claim 1, Claim 33 is not anticipated by Pioch. As Claims 34 and 35 depend from Claim 33, Applicant submits Claims 34 and 35 are also not anticipated by Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 33-35.

Claims 22-23, 25, and 27 are not anticipated by Appelman

Applicant respectfully traverses the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 22-23, 25 and 27.

In the Office Action at page 12, paragraph 30, the Examiner stated:

Claims 22-23, 25, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Appelman (US Pat. 6,677,968).

With regard to Claim 22, the Examiner at pages 12, 13, paragraph 31 stated in part:

...Appelman discloses a graphical user interface for display to a user on a display device of a commuter system coupled to a network, said graphical user interface comprising:

at least one selectable identifier of a target computer system coupled to a network, said selectable identifier identifying an target computer system for connection in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session (FIG. 3 and column 4, lines 9-18); and

at least one selectable identifier of a program selected from the group consisting of a script, a bot, and an agent, said selectable identifier identifying a program for execution in the synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session (Fig. 3 and column 4, lines 9-18, the names that populate the "Buddy List" represent an IM agent running a certain computer, that agent additionally associated with a particular user).

Claim 22 recites in part at least:

...at least one selectable identifier of a target computer system coupled to a network, the selectable identifier identifying a target computer system

connectable in a synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session; and

at least one selectable identifier of a program selected from the group consisting of a script, a bot, and an agent, the selectable identifier identifying a program executable in the synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session. (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman at col. 4, lines 9-18 relied on by the Examiner merely describe display of a Buddy List which includes "...names (or addresses) of user-selected co-users..." Thus, the citations fail to describe or suggest at least a GUI comprising **both** (1) an identifier identifying a target computer system **connectable in synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session; and** (2) a selectable identifier of a program that is **executable in the synchronous collaborative shell integrated instant messaging session**, where the program is a script, a bot, or an agent.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman relied on by the Examiner fail to support an anticipation rejection of Claim 22. As Claims 23, 25 and 27 depend from Claim 22, Applicant submits Claims 23, 25, and 27 are also not anticipated by Appelman.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of each of Claims 22-23, 25 and 27.

Rejections - 35 USC §103

Claims 13-18 are not obvious over Pioch in view of Appelman

Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 13-18.

In the Office Action at page 14, paragraph 36, the Examiner stated:

Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claims 5 and 12 above, and further in view of Appelman.

Claims 13-18 depend from Claim 5. Applicant respectfully submit that for at least reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 5, Claims 13-18 are not anticipated by Pioch.

The citations to Appelman in combination with Pioch do not cure the deficiencies of Pioch. More particularly, citing to Claim 5, the citations to Appelman with Pioch do not describe or suggest:

...intercepting the text by a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on the user computer system to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server to permit a user of the user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the user computer system...

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the references to Pioch and Appelman relied on by the Examiner, alone or in combination, fail to support an obviousness rejection of Claim 5. As Claims 13-18 depend from Claim 5, Applicant submits Claims 13-18 are also not obvious over Pioch in view of Appelman.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 13-18.

Claim 31 is not obvious over Pioch in view of McGee

Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejection of Claim 31.

In the Office Action at page 16, paragraph 43, the Examiner stated:

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pioch as applied to claim 30 above, and further in view of McGee et al (US Pub. No. 2004/0019701), hereafter "McGee".

Claim 31 depends from Claim 30. Applicant respectfully submits that for at least reasons earlier discussed with regard to Claim 30 and Claim 1, Claim 30 is not anticipated by Pioch. The citations to McGee at [0023] in combination with Pioch do not cure the deficiencies of Pioch. More particularly, citing to Claim 30, the citations to McGee in combination with Pioch do not describe or suggest:

...intercepting the text at the IM server computer system by a collaborative shell program, the collaborative shell program for linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on the first user computer system to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on the IM server to permit a user of the first user computer system to issue commands to at least one target computer system on the network via a chat window displayed to the user on the first user computer system, wherein the text includes one or more characters....

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits the references to Pioch and McGee relied on by the Examiner, alone or in combination, fail to support an obviousness rejection of Claim 30. As Claim 31 depends from Claim 30, Applicant submits that Claim 31 is also not obvious over Pioch in view of McGee.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 31.

Claims 36-39 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch

In the Office Action at page 17, paragraph 45, the Examiner stated:

Claims 36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Appelman in view of Pioch.

Claims 36 and 37 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 36 and 37.

Claim 36 recites in part at least:

...periodically querying from a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server computer system one or more target computer systems on a network for status information, the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on an IM server to permit users of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to the one or more target computer systems on the network via a chat window displayed to users on the one or more user computer systems.... (emphasis added)

As earlier described with reference to Claim 1 and Claim 22, Applicant respectfully submits the citations to Appelman and Pioch relied on by the Examiner, alone or in combination fail to describe or suggest at least "the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on an IM server to permit users of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to the one or more target computer systems on the network via a chat window displayed to users on the one or more user computer systems..."

as recited in part in Claim 36. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits Claim 36 is not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch. As Claim 37 depends from Claim 36, Applicant submits Claim 37 is also not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 36 and 37.

Claims 38 and 39 are not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch

Applicant respectfully traverses the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 38 and 39.

Claim 38 recites in part at least:

...periodically querying from a collaborative shell program on an instant messaging (IM) server computer system at least one program selected from the group consisting of a script, a bot, and an agent for status information, **the collaborative shell program linking a command line interface of a command line interface (CLI) shell program on one or more user computer systems to an instant messaging/chat capability of an IM server application on an IM server to permit users of the one or more user computer systems to issue commands to the one or more target computer systems on the network via a chat window displayed to the users on the one or more user computer systems....** (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that for at least the same reasons as Claim 36, Claim 38 is not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch. As Claim 39 depends from Claim 38, Applicant submits Claim 39 is also not obvious over Appelman in view of Pioch.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejections of each of Claims 38 and 39.

Conclusion

Claims 1-23, 25, 27, and 30-39 are pending.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on November 15, 2007.



Attorney for Applicant(s)

November 15 2007
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa A. Norris
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 44,976
Tel.: (831) 655-0880